



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,378	01/26/2001	Tomoyuki Hamamura	P 276743 T41A-00S0916	5764
909	7590	03/24/2004	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP			DESIRE, GREGORY M	
P.O. BOX 10500			ART UNIT	
MCLEAN, VA 22102			PAPER NUMBER	

2625

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/769,378

Applicant(s)

HAMAMURA, TOMOYUKI

Examiner

Gregory M. Desire

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 4 and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 8-10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seybold et al (6,005,973) in view of Burges et al (5,727,081).

Regarding claims 1 and 7 Seybold discloses,

A character recognition-processing step of performing recognition processing of an input character string that corresponds to a word to be recognized by each character, thereby obtaining the character recognition result (note fig. 2 block 200 and 201 and col. 3 lines 2-5, Recognition is performed an input characters).

A probability calculation step of obtaining a probability at which characteristics obtained as the character recognition results are generated by said character recognition processing by conditioning characters of words contained in a word dictionary that stores in advance a candidate of the word to be recognized (note fig. 2 block 202, col. 3 lines 10-15, Likelihood obtained from results from dictionary entries).

A word recognition-processing step of obtaining recognition results based on computation results (note fig. 2 block 203 and col. 3 lines 63-65, likely string of digits is obtained recognition results);

Art Unit: 2625

Seybold is silent disclosing computation steps performing a predetermined computation between a probabilities and characteristics from recognition results. However, Burges discloses a computation step performing predetermined computation between probabilities and characteristics from recognition results (note col. 15 line 55 – col. 16 line 6, predetermined computation is performed using character string results and general probability). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art to include computation step in the system of Seybold as evidenced by Burges. Seybold performs character recognition step and Seybold in the same field of endeavor compute probabilities providing an improved method for interpreting sequences more accurate (note col. 3 lines 40-50).

Regarding claim 3 Seybold and Burges discloses,

Wherein information on a characters and non-characters is included in the characters of the words contained in said dictionary (note Seybold col. 3 lines 25-31, identifies information contained in the dictionary).

Regarding claim 4 Seybold and Burges discloses,

Wherein a probability at which a word containing information on said non-characters is generated based on a probability at which a word that does not contain non-character information is generated (note Burges col. 13 lines 40-45, probability of input characters).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 5-6 allowed.
4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance independent claim 5. The additional limitation of delimiting steps in combination with other features is not taught in the prior art. Claim 6 is dependent on claim 5. Therefore also allowable.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

5. Claims 2 and 8-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Regarding claims 2 and 8, the delimiting features in combination with other features are not taught in the prior art.

Claims 9-10 are dependent upon objected claims. Therefore are also objected.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory M. Desire whose telephone number is (703)

Art Unit: 2625


308-9586. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) Second Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (703) 308-5246. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory M. Desire
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

G.D.
March 16, 2004



BHAVESH M. MEHTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600